

REMARKS

Further and favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks.

Claims 7-18 are pending in this application.

Claims 7, 10, 13 and 16 have been amended to recite “to obtain” or “to remove” in order to end each claim with a conclusion commensurate in scope with the preamble.

Claims 8, 11, 14 and 17 are amended to further define the oxidative environment of claims 7, 10, 13 and 16, respectively.

Claims 9, 15 and 18 are amended to recite “a temperature range of 0°C to 500°C” in order to recite one specific temperature range.

The specification has been amended to replace “vanish”, “vanished”, “vanishes” and “vanishing” with “lyse”, “lysed”, “lyses” and “lysing”, respectively.

Thus, no new matter has been added by the amendments.

I. Personal Interview

Applicants thank Examiner Kelly for the courtesies extended to Applicants’ attorney during the Personal Interview held April 6, 2010.

During the interview, Applicants’ attorney proposed to amend the claims corresponding with the enclosed amendments. In addition, Example 1 and Figure 1 of the present application were discussed with the Examiner.

Examiner Kelly agreed that the amendments to claims 7-18 overcome all of the pending rejections and objection.

II. Double Patenting

In the Office Action, the Examiner indicates that should any one of claims 8, 11, 14 or 17 be allowed, then claims 9, 12, 15 or 18, respectively, will be objected to under 37 C.F.R § 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate thereof. During the interview, the Examiner indicated that Applicants’ amendments to claims 8, 11, 14 and 17 would overcome this potential objection.

III. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

A. Second Paragraph

The Examiner rejects claims 7-18 under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. As agreed to during the interview, the amendments to claims 7-18 overcome the rejection. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

B. First Paragraph

The Examiner rejects claims 7-9 under 35 USC § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. As agreed to during the interview, support for the amended claims can be found in Example 1 and Figure 1 of the present specification (see pages 6-7 of the specification). Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

The Examiner also rejects claims 7-9 under 35 USC § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. As agreed to during the interview, the subject matter of claims 7-9 is fully supported by the present application, such as in Example 1 and Figure 1. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

IV. Conclusion

For these reasons, Applicants take the position that the presently claimed invention is clearly patentable.

Therefore, in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the objection and rejections set forth by the Examiner have been overcome, and that the application is in condition for allowance. Such allowance is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Sumio IJIMA et al.

By **/Andrew B. Freistein/**

Digitally signed by /Andrew B. Freistein/
DN: cn=/Andrew B. Freistein/, o=WLP, ou=WLP, email=afreistein@wenderoth.com, c=US
Date: 2010.04.22 13:05:22 -04'00'

Andrew B. Freistein
Registration No. 52,917
Attorney for Applicants

ABF/emj
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
April 22, 2010